DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 128 966 — EA 008 743

AUTHOR Schmuck, Patricia A.
TITLE The Spirit of Title IX: Men's Work and Women's Work in Oregon Public Schools. OSSC Bulletin Vol. 20, No. 2.
INSTITUTION Oregon School Study Council, Eugene.
PUB DATE Oct 76
NOTE 30p.
AVAILABLE FROM Oregon School Study Council, 124 College of Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403 ($1.50, quantity discounts)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; Comparative Analysis; *Educational Administration; *Employment Practices; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Leadership Styles; Marital Status; Occupational Surveys; Organizational Effectiveness; *Promotion (Occupational); Research Reviews (Publications); Role Conflict; *Sex Discrimination; Sex Role; Sex Stereotypes; Working Women
IDENTIFIERS Oregon

ABSTRACT

While there is near parity in Oregon between the numbers of men and women in education, within the profession men and women are segregated by sex. It is clear that sex, more than age, experience, background, or competence, is the major determinant for the occupational role an individual will hold within the profession. The purposes of this paper are (1) to explain the concept of sex role stereotyping and how it guides the behavior of men and women, (2) to illustrate how one's sex has directly affected men's and women's career paths in the field, (3) to explain how sex segregation is perpetuated, and (4) to describe the possible consequences of sex inequity in school management for the functioning of schools. (Author/MLF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED128966

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OSSC BULLETIN

THE SPIRIT OF TITLE IX: MEN'S WORK AND WOMEN'S WORK IN OREGON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

by
Patricia A. Schmuck

Oregon School Study Council
Vol. 20, No. 2
October 1976

2

EA 008 243

OSSC BULLETIN

THE SPIRIT OF TITLE IX:
MEN'S WORK AND WOMEN'S WORK IN OREGON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

by

Patricia A. Schmuck

Individual copy price - $1.50

PREFACE

Education seems a particularly appropriate field in which to raise the question about men's work and women's work. Unlike the professionals in other fields such as medicine, business or law, the professionals in education are predominantly women. Nationally, 34% of the certificated personnel in education are men; 66% are women (Fischel and Pottker, 1974). In Oregon, there is a more nearly equal ratio of 44% men, 56% women. In spite of their greater numbers, however, women have only rarely had access to the administrative positions, 97% of which are held by men.

This Bulletin examines the concepts of "women's work" and "men's work" in education. Its intent is to raise the awareness level of Oregon educators as we all attempt to achieve equity between the sexes in educational leadership. While there is near parity in Oregon between the numbers of men and women in education, within the profession men and women are segregated by sex. It is clear that sex, more than age, experience, background or competence, is the major determinant for the occupational role an individual will hold within the profession.

In an attempt to remedy inequities in educational administration, Patricia A. Schmuck, along with her colleagues Jane Arends, Richard O. Carlson, and Jean Stockard, directs the Sex Equity in Educational Leadership project funded by the United States Office of Education. The project will build and demonstrate a model in Oregon for achieving sex equity in educational administration.

More information about the Sex Equity in Educational Leadership project will be sent to all Oregon school districts in the near future. Persons wishing further information may contact Patricia A. Schmuck at the Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1472 Kincaid, Eugene, Oregon 97401, (503) 686-5074.

Gail Fullington
Assistant Executive Secretary
Oregon School Study Council

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Sex Role Stereotypes	2
Sex Segregation in Oregon Public Schools	7
Table 1: Distribution of Men and Women Teachers at School Levels, 1974-1975	8
Table 2: Percentage of Non-Classroom Teaching Certified Personnel by Sex and Assignment, 1974-75	9
Sex Segregation Perpetuated	9
The Differential Effects of Marriage and Family	10
Women Are One Reason for Sex Inequity in Management	12
Men Are One Reason for Sex Inequity in School Management	14
Women: A Psychological Threat in a Feminized Field	15
Women: The Labor Threat	16
Sex Inequity and Organizational Functioning	17
References	23

THE SPIRIT OF TITLE IX:
MEN'S WORK AND WOMEN'S WORK IN OREGON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

"We can wait no longer. Equal educational opportunity for women is the law of the land—and it will be enforced," Casper Weingartner, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, declared when Title IX was introduced to Congress in 1972. The legislation stipulates that "no person . . . shall, on the basis of sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." House Bill 2131 is Oregon's strong supplement to the national mandate prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex.*

Title IX also deals with the employment practices of school districts and prohibits discrimination in the recruitment, advertising, promotion and process of application for employment. It specifically states:

> A recipient shall not discriminate on the basis of sex in the recruitment and hiring of employees. Where a recipient has been found to be presently discriminating on the basis of sex in the recruitment or hiring of employees, or has been found to have in the past so discriminated, the recipient shall recruit members of the sex so discriminated against so as to overcome the effects of such past or present discrimination.

While it is clear that the impetus for current legislation was derived from women's demands for change and that legislation is

---

*Oregon House Bill 2131 also prohibits discrimination on the basis of age, race, handicap, marital status, national origin and religion.

primarily targeted toward guaranteeing avenues of access and opportunity for women, it is a mistake to view the mandate as only a women's issue. If women are the victims of stereotypes which prescribe certain behaviors and social positions, it is inevitable that men are relegated to other behaviors and social positions. Title IX is important legislation for females and males; it is another step toward guaranteeing individual freedom without the social constraints of biological destiny.

Legally, Title IX prescribes the perimeters of allowable behavior under federally assisted programs. Whereas the mechanisms for enforcement are yet to be determined by the courts, the spirit of the legislation is clear: It tackles the deeply rooted issue of sex role stereotyping. It is to the spirit of the legislation that this paper is addressed. My purposes are fourfold:

1) To explain the concept of sex role stereotyping and how it guides the behavior of men and women,

2) To illustrate how one's sex has directly affected men's and women's career paths in the field,

3) To explain how sex segregation is perpetuated, and

4) To describe the possible consequences of sex inequity in school management for the functioning of schools.

Sex Role Stereotypes

A stereotype is a preconception; it is a picture in our heads ascribing generalized group characteristics to an individual. Plumbers are fat, electricians are skinny, red-heads have fiery tempers, Blacks have rhythm, old people are conservative, young people are liberal, men are competitive, librarians are compulsive, film stars have loose

morals, and women are nurturant—these are examples of stereotypes.

Sex stereotyping is the process by which we attribute characteristics to individuals on the basis of their sex. It is a process through which we are predisposed to believe that an individual—because she is a female, or because he is a male—will think and behave in prescribed ways and will occupy certain social positions in society. It is prescribing a social role to individuals on the basis of their sex.

One anecdote illustrates sex role stereotyping at work. On a recent airplane trip I conversed with my male seat partner. He asked what kind of work I did. I told him I taught. Having no other information about me other than that I was a woman teacher flying alone, he immediately recounted his early experiences in school and expressed his belief about the importance of elementary school years. He deplored the fact that the early years often were neglected in favor of high school education. He spoke about elementary education for about ten minutes and finally asked what age students I taught. I replied, "About 20 years old." He laughed at his mistake. It is understandable that he would assume I was an elementary school teacher since most females who teach are elementary school teachers. Yet this example illustrates the process of sex role stereotyping; it is doubtful he would have made such an assumption had his seat partner been male. In fact, he probably would have presumed that a male teacher worked with older students. It has been only in the last few decades that elementary school teaching has been viewed as an appropriate masculine activity. Today men comprise 32% of Oregon elementary school teachers, compared to 25% in 1966.

Some say that sex stereotyping is an inevitable process rising out of inherent differences between males and females, arguing that differentiation of the sexes is due to in-born biological characteristics. Whether there are biological differences or not, biology alone cannot account for the differing social roles of men and women. It cannot be denied that there are differences between boys and girls and men and women. Social reality proclaims the differences in most daily interactions. It is questionable, however, what has brought about these sex differences. Maccoby and Jacklin in a monumental work, The Psychology of Sex Differences (1976), investigated over 1400 studies; they report some male-female differences are based on impressive evidence, others are based on pure mythology and others are inadequately tested. They conclude:

> We suggest that societies have the option of minimizing, rather than maximizing, sex differences through their socialization practices. . . . In our view social institutions and social practices are not merely reflections of biological inevitability. A variety of social institutions are viable within the framework set up by biology. It is up to human beings to select those that foster the life styles they most value. (p. 374)

In education we maximize sex differences in several ways. One way it is done is by the non-random deployment of personnel based on sex. There is impressive evidence to suggest that sex role stereotyping is an important social mechanism used to perpetuate and increase career differences between boys and girls and men and women. One study investigated the degree to which individuals attribute certain personality characteristics and behaviors to males and females (Broverman, et al., 1972). Using a questionnaire with almost 1,000 subjects the

researchers found high agreement on the norms and behavioral attributes surrounding the sex roles of men and women in our society. Women were perceived as less competent, less independent, less objective and less logical than men. Men were perceived as lacking interpersonal sensitivity, warmth and expressiveness as compared to women. The researchers concluded that stereotypic differences between men and women are accepted by a large segment of our society. This is not an argument testifying to the inevitability of sex differences; the researchers argue that boys and girls learn to become the adult images of stereotyped men and women.

Differing norms surrounding the appropriate behavior of men and women translate directly to the occupational world; men are to assume roles requiring initiative, independence, objectivity, leadership and ability; women are to fill roles requiring following directions, passivity, nurturance and maintaining favorable relationships. These sex role related behaviors are very visible in education. Because men and women comprise the professionals in the field, it is appropriate for a female to take initiative, be objective and perform leadership functions if those behaviors are in relation to students. It is men, however, who assume positions of leadership and issue directives to adult professionals. Female educators often are subordinate to male managers. A majority of men and women in education expect men to take the reins of leadership and manage schools.

Women who aspire to fulfill an occupational role traditionally held by men face evident role conflicts; they stand between one set of interpersonal expectations for how they should behave as women and a

contrasting set of expectations for how they should behave as administrators. On the one hand, they are supposed to be subservient, nurturant and maintain affective relationships, yet as administrators they are supposed to be independent, assume leadership and be task oriented. One woman administrator said,

> People seem to have the expectation that a professional woman is brittle and hard. People are surprised that I'm soft and feminine. I'm not forceful. Yet I can be hard. I can do my job even if it is distasteful.

Equal to the role conflict of women assuming traditional male roles is the conflict of men who fill traditional female roles. In fact, the male has often been overlooked in discussions about sex role stereotypes. Some suggest that young boys and men have greater pressures on them to achieve "masculinity" than girls or women face to be "feminine." A young girl typified as a tomboy does not have as many negative sanctions placed upon her as a young boy typified as a "sissy." In textbooks girls are typed as passive, nurturant, and uncreative. The role models for young boys are adventurous, daring and initiatory. Some researchers have suggested that the superman" models provided young boys do not help them to prepare for the fairly ordinary family lives most of them live. (Britton, 1973, others)

A woman who aspires to be a kindergarten teacher all of her life is not viewed as a career failure, whereas a man who aspires to such a life-long ambition is not only seen as a career failure but his masculinity might even be viewed with some suspicion. Men, especially in the elementary school, are expected to move up to administrative positions as quickly as possible. Many men, happy and successful as

capable classroom teachers yet pressured by the social norms for career success, have left their classrooms for less satisfying roles as administrators. As one male administrator said, "Administration is a people-killing job." Warren Farrell, in his book, The Liberated Male, explains that if women have been damaged by being stereotyped as sex objects, men have borne an equal burden by being success objects. Men and women alike are thus victims of sex role stereotyping.

Sex Segregation in Oregon Public Schools

Sex role stereotyping carries such force within the field of education that sex, rather than experience, age, or level of training is the best predictor of the occupational role an individual will hold in the field. Knowing nothing other than an individual's sex, one can predict with fair accuracy the educational position held by the person. If one is a woman, the best prediction is that she is an elementary school teacher; such a prediction will be correct over half the time. If one is a man, the best prediction is that he is a high school teacher. (Of course, the classroom teacher prediction is the best one for any educator, since 85% of Oregon's certified personnel are classroom teachers rather than administrators.) The distribution of men and women teachers by school levels is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF MEN AND WOMEN TEACHERS
AT SCHOOL LEVELS, 1974-1975

	Women (14,210)	Men (10,318)
Elementary School	57%	27%
Junior High School	9%	18%
Senior High School	16%	41%
Multi-level or Unknown	18%	14%
	100%	100%

If one is not a classroom teacher, the predictions become more accurate. If one is a woman who is not in classroom teaching, she will most likely hold a position in special education or, second most often, be a librarian. These two positions account for 70% of the women who are not classroom teachers. If one is a man, he will most likely be an administrator: 60% of the non-teaching males in Oregon public schools are administrators. If he is not an administrator, he will most likely be in charge of adult professionals in a supervisory capacity. The percentages of non-teaching positions in Oregon are illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2

PERCENTAGE OF NON-CLASSROOM TEACHING CERTIFIED PERSONNEL
BY SEX AND ASSIGNMENT, 1974-75

	Women (2,434)	Men (3,617)
Principal, Superintendent, Asst. Prin., Asst. Supt., Head Teacher	01%	40%
Central Office Support Staff	08%	20%
Counselors	15%	12%
Coordinators/Directors/Supervisors	06%	13%
Librarians	24%	03%
Special Education	46%	12%
	100%	100%

The supervisory role of males is even further substantiated in the special education field. Whereas women hold 75% of special education positions, men hold 40% of the supervisory positions in special education. Even within the Intermediate Education Districts in Oregon, women comprise 61% of the special education assignments, yet men hold 76% of the director positions.

Sex Segregation Perpetuated

Certainly education is not exempt from the forces of the larger society. The segregation of the sexes in education is not a surprising

phenomenon when we view the role of women and men within the society at large. In this section I will briefly review the differential effects of marriage and family upon the career paths of men and women and illustrate how prevalent sex-typed norms guide the behaviors of men and women educators. These forces work to perpetuate the concept of "man's work" and "woman's work" in the field.

The Differential Effects of Marriage and Family

Men's and women's traditional roles in the family play an important part in their differential career development. In general, marriage is a career asset to a man, whereas it is a career deterrent for women. Men in high administrative positions are expected to be married. Carlson states, "Simply being married enhances a school superintendent's career opportunities," (p. 26, 1972). He further states that marriage is so crucial to the superintendent's career that editors of professional journals allocate space rehearsing the role of the superintendent's wife and her importance to her husband's career. The implication, of course, is for males. Bachelorhood may invite positive fantasies of freedom but is not a condition sanctioned by school boards looking for someone to fill a high administrative position in a school district. In 1950, 79% of 612 interviewed superintendents and school board members stated that a superintendent should be married (Cook and Cook, 1950). Implicitly these statements refer to a man's mobility toward the superintendency. Education is not unique in this regard. A successful male in the public eye is expected to be married; exceptions such as Governor Brown of California cause public attention. Brown's bachelor status

perhaps has received as much media attention as has his political ideology.

For women, however, it is a different matter. Women with careers in administration are more likely than men to be unmarried, but marriage itself no longer remains the reason that women leave education. Today child bearing accounts for the largest proportion of female teachers leaving the field every year. Although today over one-third of the women with pre-school children are in the labor force, there continue to be negative judgments about the working mother. The working mother has been of concern, and many researchers have investigated the effects of working mothers upon the social and psychological development of their children (Nye and Hoffman, 1963). It has been only in the last few years that books have been written about the importance of the father's influence in child development (Lynn, 1974).

Raising a family affects women's careers in direct ways. Women who want to pursue advanced education do not uproot husbands and children to take up residence at a university. Women more often interrupt their educational careers to be at home with young children (although in past years men's careers in education were often interrupted by military service or pursuing another career). And women do not advance in their careers by moving their families from one school district to another. Women who become administrators typically enter administrative positions at a later age and generally have more experience as classroom teachers than their male counterparts (Gross and Trask, 1976).

Without doubt, marriage and children have differential effects on the careers of men and women in education and in our society. Whereas

marriage and family help men's career development, they handicap women's career mobility. Yet there are many men and women who are searching for new ways to organize their professional and personal lives. Some men feel deprived of sharing in the joys and burdens of child rearing, and many women wishing to pursue careers are unwilling to make the either/or choices professional jobs have traditionally demanded. Innovative job arrangements such as job-sharing, part-time positions and organizational day care arrangements are among some attempts to provide males and females greater latitude in finding a congruent balance between their personal lives and professional pursuits.

Although marriage and family have differential effects on the careers of men and women, women administrators who are unmarried or divorced, with or without children, have followed a career line more similar to married women than to married men. In studying the career development of administrators in education, Carlson distinguishes between career-bound and place-bound persons. Whereas career-bound persons take an active role in the pursuit of career objectives, take positions on the basis of career—not place, and actively confront the environment to get ahead, place-bound persons are the ones who wait for higher positions to open up. Place-bound persons' careers are ascents through the hierarchy of only a few school systems. Women, regardless of marital status, fit the description of place-bound persons (Schmuck, 1976).

Women Are One Reason for Sex Inequity in Management

Women's careers in education are different from men's as a result of double standards about marriage and because women's mobility,

regardless of marriage, reflects those who wait for positions and do not actively pursue their career objectives. For whatever reasons, women have not aspired to be administrators and have not actively sought management positions. Women are part of the reason there isn't a greater equalization of the sexes in educational management.

In reviewing the applicants for administrative jobs in an urban school district I found that only 14% of the applicants were women. Among the women administrators I interviewed over half had been pulled into their positions by a male superordinate; most women administrators had not gone through the formal screening and selection process. Women generally do not seek the necessary credentials to assume administrative posts; when women return to graduate school they most often enter the psychological service fields such as special education. At the University of Oregon in 1975, I was the ninth female to graduate in the history of the Department of Educational Administration, compared to 285 males who had obtained their degrees.

A formidable barrier to women's entry and advancement in educational administration is their lack of self-confidence in relation to males. Many women have psychologically internalized the inferior role society has created for them. There is substantial psychological literature explaining women's lack of achievement and suggesting that women conspire toward failure (Horner, 1972). Among the women administrators in Oregon with whom I've talked, comments such as the following were common.

> I began feeling very inferior, then I found out I could keep up. I could reason and I had a pretty good mind after all.

> For this job I was asked. If it had been otherwise I would never have applied for it. I wouldn't have thought I had very good qualifications.

Furthermore, because of the scarcity of women administrators, women do not have readily available role models to follow. The lack of female role models--for female teachers as well as female students--is significant in perpetuating the unequal distribution of males and females in administration. For instance, I met one woman who had to be pulled into her elementary principal position because, "I just never really thought about being a principal because they were all men."

Many women directly apply to themselves the sex-role stereotype of inferiority abounding in our society and within the field of education. In order to achieve sex equity in school management, women will have to learn to take a realistic look at their own competencies and capabilities, recognize their strengths and work on their weaknesses. Women cannot afford to accept and believe the inferior status ascribed to them by society if they are to assume shared responsibility for running our schools.

Men Are One Reason for Sex Inequity in School Management

Men, likewise, are guided by sex role stereotypes granting the superiority of men and the inferiority of women. Men are the gatekeepers to positions of school management; they comprise the total or the majority of places on screening committees, they are in the positions to advise and counsel recruits to the field, and they are in the top supervisory positions in school districts. In interviews with men and women administrators I discovered that there are two prominent

forces that perpetuate sex inequity in management. Women administrators often pose a "psychological threat" to their male colleagues and women's demands for change create a labor force threat in an ever-tightening job market.

Women: A Psychological Threat in a Feminized Field. The psychological threat posed by women administrators lies in the stereotype of the inferior status of women in society. Men in education, unlike other professional fields, have the stigma of being in a "feminized field." The predominance of women has been associated with low social prestige of the field, resulting in education's being called a semi- or quasi-profession (Etzioni, 1969). The rising prestige and lucrativeness of education is associated with the advent of increasing numbers of men since World War II. As one woman said,

> We have to give men their quarter. It was when men finally came into education—after World War II—that they were militant enough to get pay raises and make it a respectable profession.

Harriet Holter (1970) in a large-scale study of the Norwegian labor force hypothesized that the prestige of an occupational field is directly related to the proportion of men and women in the field; as the field gains in prestige there are increasing numbers of men and decreasing numbers of women. In support of that hypothesis, Touhey (1974) has looked at citizen attitudes toward the prestige of the occupation of nursery school teacher. He found that when men occupy the position of nursery school teacher, the prestige of the position rises as compared to when women hold the position.

Men in a "feminized field" gain their self-worth and social

importance by being in supervisory positions over females. In the past, men who entered education typically did so as a second choice. Male educators typically had lower social class background than male lawyers, doctors, or industrialists; education has been a mobility ladder for males in the past. Women in education, on the other hand, have more often come from professional families and education was one of the few career choices available to them (Gross and Trask, 1976).

Women often pose a psychological threat to men in education because the mere presence of a number of women has been associated with low social prestige. Some male educators already sensitive to the stigma of a "feminized field" must solidify their strength as "success objects." As one male principal said,

> It's easier to work without women. Principals and superintendents are a management team. It fosters interdependence and mutual support. We need each other for survival. It's no evil liaison—it's just pure politics. I wonder if we could hang together so well if some of us were women. Could she protect my job as well as her own?

Women: The Labor Threat. For the first time in our nation's history public school teaching is no longer an expanding field. The economic condition of society has directly and profoundly altered the security of jobs in education. As men increasingly enter a stabilized field, it is economically functional for them to believe that women cannot perform similar jobs. Today, screening committee interviewers ask women questions such as,

> What will you do if the lights go out? How will you handle the custodian? What will you do if one of your children gets sick?

Today women are viewed as functionally incapable of activities they may

have performed in the past. When there were few males to choose from for administrative positions, women were encouraged to take the positions. Today, with increasing numbers of men, women are encouraged less. Men as the gatekeepers to the profession recruit other men, sometimes justifying such behaviors out of a belief that women will be inferior administrators.

Not all male educators hold such views about women's incapability. Some men believe that the profession suffers because of the absence of women. "Men and women on a team create a healthy balance," and "It's the obligation of a school district to provide adult role models for the male and female children we serve" were comments from some male administrators. One man presented this view:

> We have a lot of myths about women; they are flighty, there is one time a month they cannot be depended upon to make rational decisions, they cannot be detached and are too emotional. Typical minority prejudices. The people in power tend to hold such myths about the minority and then increase the myths. We've done a brilliant job of that in our predominantly male organization.

Sex Inequity and Organizational Functioning

Sex inequity in school management is a negative force in education; our school's resources are not being fully used when sex, rather than competence, determines who performs certain jobs. Sex role stereotypes also infringe on the individual career choices of males and females and limit rather than enhance individual freedom. Also, the segregation of the sexes limits the individual freedom of students. Educators are important adult role models; students' day-to-day experiences of seeing

"men's work" and "women's work" can only perpetuate the same restricting sex role stereotypes which have faced our generation. Few arguments, however, have explored the possible implications of segregation of the sexes upon the functioning of the school organization itself.

Four independent studies have investigated the differences between men and women's leadership style in the elementary school (Grobman and Hines, 1956; Hemphill, Griffiths, Frederickson, 1962; Gross and Trask, 1976; and Gross and Herriott, 1965). These studies indicated that women principals were more democratic; had schools with more positive teacher, student and parent attitudes toward education, had higher degrees of professionalism; and demonstrated superior student performance. These findings have been used to demonstrate the superiority of women in leadership roles. However, one does not have to take the sexist position implied in this conclusion. All men and all women are not what our stereotypes impute them to be. There are more differences among men and among women than there are differences between men and women. The mere addition of women, by virtue of being women, to influential positions in our society cannot stop wars or improve our schools. Men, by virtue of being men, cannot raise healthier children or better solve the emotional problems of youth. Yet the Pentagon, school districts and schools might emerge as differently functioning organizations, perhaps more effective ones, if the sexes were not segregated and women held comparable power to men. Elementary school classrooms may take on a different climate if more men became teachers of primary grades. The segregation of men and women serves to perpetuate sex-typed role relationships which affect the dynamics of the school organization itself.

Because of the sex stereotyped roles of men and women in society and in education, the dynamics of leadership and followership are affected by the sex of the participants. For instance, in all of the aforementioned studies demonstrating the superior capability of women elementary school principals, the fact of the sexes of the followers has been totally ignored. In elementary schools it is safe to presume that the staffs were predominantly—if not totally—female. Although it is certainly possible that women who survive the rigors of sex-biased administrative selection stand "head and shoulders" above their male counterparts, I suggest the interaction of male superordinates with female subordinates is of a different order than the interaction of female superordinates and female subordinates. Leadership is a transactional process; it occurs between leaders and followers.

Most studies investigating the interactional process between bosses and workers have ignored the sex of the individuals involved. Acker and Van Houton (1974) have re-examined two classic studies in organizational behavior in light of the sex of the actors in the situation. In organizational studies the persons in superordinate positions usually are men and the subordinates tend to be women. Acker and Van Houton propose that in a sex segregated society males hold superior status by virtue of being male, and females hold inferior status by virtue of being female. When the traditional superior social status of a man is coupled with the position of being boss over a woman who holds inferior status in society, his power is amplified in the work situation. In other words a male boss holds more power over a female worker than he holds over male workers and more power than a female boss holds over

a female or male worker. In another study the sex of the leader was an important characteristic in subjects' evaluation of the leader's management style (Bartol and Butterfield, 1976).

There is a vast discrepancy in the boss-worker relationship between the sexes. In Oregon 56% of the teachers are female; 94% of the principals and 99.8% of the superintendents are male. Males are most often in superordinate roles and females are in the subordinate roles.

One anecdote illustrates how the interaction between female-female is different than between male-female. A female elementary school principal was telling me about her exciting school and her success in student and teacher participation in problem solving. They used consensus, there was shared legitimate power among teachers, and parents and students were successfully involved in policy and curricular decisions. During one year she was on a part-time study leave and whenever she left the building a male teacher became the acting principal. He shared her values and philosophy about the way the school was to be run and supported the active participation of teachers, students and parents. Yet he was frustrated and felt incompetent because when she went away teachers and students came to him and demanded unilateral decisions. "You decide what to do" was the message presented to him, although that was contrary to the established organizational procedures in that school under the leadership of the female principal.

The female members of this school deferred to the male--not on the basis of his legitimate authority in the school, but on the basis of his superior status in society. Females in a subordinate relation to a

male defer to him and expect him to make decisions. Females in relation to a female boss will not defer as readily; the female boss is able to involve more participation in school-wide decisions.

In situations where a female is in a leadership position over male subordinates, interaction between the leader and the followers would look quite different from the traditional male-female relationship. If a woman occupies a traditionally male sex-typed job (such as a superintendent or high school principal) her actions will be viewed differently than a man's; she will create more public attention, and she will have to clearly demonstrate superior competence to gain the respect of her staff members. Because she is supposedly inferior by virtue of being female, her expected power advantage over male subordinates is neutralized. In fact, if she does not gain the respect of her staff members it is highly unlikely that she can survive her vulnerable position. A female would have to involve staff members in decisions. She could not "slide by" with the superiority granted in her sex, as a man could.

Sex-power relationships seem to occur only under conditions of sex segregation and social norms concerning the division of "men's work" and "women's work." When there is increasing blending of men's and women's roles and a decreasing of sex role stereotypes, the dynamics of the relationships between supervisors and supervised depends more upon the behavior of the individuals than on the sex of the individual actors. But in education today, sex segregation does exist and the interaction of leaders and followers is influenced by the sex of the participants.

The cost for maintaining a sex-segregated field is too high for schools, for students and for professionals. The current social division of men's work and women's work is dysfunctional. We can no longer afford stereotyped "masculine" or "feminine" behaviors from our professionals. We need leaders who exhibit characteristics of being a nurturant, affective, catalyst for others' ideas as well as exhibiting initiative and task-oriented energy. Concepts of "masculine" and "feminine" or men's work and women's work are outmoded and irrelevant criteria for choosing or recruiting school leaders. We need individuals who are able to rise above the restricting and confining social sex role stereotypes and behave in appropriate ways demanded by the task at hand. An increase of males in traditional female roles and an increase of women in traditional male roles offers a leverage point. Achieving sex equity offers wider freedom of career choice for male and female students and future educators and offers the opportunity to positively affect the functioning of the organization itself. Title IX offers us the spirit for the adventure. I ask, not rhetorically, what have we--as males and females and as a profession--got to lose?

REFERENCES

Acker, Joan and Donald R. Van Houton. 1974. "Differential Recruitment and Control: The Sex Structuring of Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly, June, pp. 152-163.

Bartol, Kathryn and D. Anthony Butterfield. 1976. "Sex Effects in Evaluating Leaders." Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 4, 446-454.

Britton, Gwyneth. 1973. "Sex Stereotyping and Career Roles." Journal of Reading, 17, 2, 140-148.

Broverman, Inge, et al. 1972. "Sex Role Stereotypes: A Current Appraisal." Journal of Social Issues, 28, 2, 59-78.

Carlson, Richard O. 1972. School Superintendent Careers and Performance. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Cook, Lloyd and Elaine Cook. 1950. A Sociological Approach to Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Etzioni, Amitai. 1969. The Semi Professions and Their Organization. New York: The Free Press.

Fischel, Andrew and Janice Pottker. 1974. "Women in Educational Governance: A Statistical Portrait." AERA, July-August.

Grobman, Hulda and Vynce Hines. 1956. "What Makes a Good Principal?" Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, November, pp. 5-16.

Gross, Neal and Anne E. Trask. 1976. The Sex Factor and the Management of Schools. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Gross, Neal and Robert Herriot. 1965. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Hemphill, John, Daniel Griffiths and Norman Frederickson. 1962. Administrative Performance and Personality. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Holter, Harriet. 1970. Sex Roles and Social Structure. Boston: Universitets-forlaget.

Horner, Martina. 1972. "Toward an Understanding of Achievement Related Conflicts in Women." Journal of Social Issues, 28, 2, 157-175.

Lynn, David B. 1974. The Father: His Role in Child Development. Monterey, California: Brooks Cole Publishing Co.

Maccoby, Eleanore and Carol Jacklin. 1975. The Psychology of Sex Differences. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Nye, F. and Lois Hoffman. 1963. The Employed Mother in America. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Schmuck, Patricia A. 1976. Sex Differentiation in Public School Administration. NCAWE, 1815 Fort Meyer Dr., North Arlington, VA 22209.

Touhey, John. 1974. "Relative Influence of Perceivers and Perceived on Attribution of Person Concepts." Social Behavior and Personality, 2, 1, 37-38.